arXiv:1403.5217v1 [math.CO] 20 Mar 2014

On the embeddability of contractible complexes

Karim A. Adiprasito *
Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques
adiprasito@ihes.fr

Bruno Benedetti **
Freie Univ. Berlin
bruno@zedat.fu-berlin.de

March 20, 2014

Abstract

We prove that all collapsible d-complexes linearly embed in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$; this is optimal.

As a consequence, we obtain a Tverberg-type theorem for metric spaces with curvature bounded above: Given $(r-1)(2d+1)+1$ points in a non-positively curved d-complex, we can partition them into r subsets whose convex hulls intersect.

Moreover, all CAT(0) 2-complexes PL-embed in $\mathbb{R}^4$, and all complexes with discrete Morse vector $(1,1,1)$ embed into $\mathbb{R}^4$ linearly.

One way to draw a graph in Euclidean space is to place its n vertices in n generic points of $\mathbb{R}^3$. The genericity condition guarantees that two segments with different endpoints will always be skew to one another. Note that *contractible* graphs (that is, trees) embed also in $\mathbb{R}^2$; but since not all graphs are planar, for arbitrary graphs $\mathbb{R}^3$ is smallest possible.

By Kuratowski's theorem both the planarity and the non-planarity property for graphs are closed under taking subdivisions. In other words, if a graph does not embed in $\mathbb{R}^2$, no subdivision of it will.

In higher dimensions the situation is much less clear. First of all, there is no analog of Kuratowski's theorem. In fact, embedding a complex or just a subdivision of it are no longer equivalent tasks. We say a complex C **linearly embeds** (resp. **PL-embeds**) in $\mathbb{R}^k$, if C (resp. some subdivision C' of C) can be realized in $\mathbb{R}^k$. We also say C **topologically embeds** in $\mathbb{R}^k$, if some subcomplex of $\mathbb{R}^k$ is homeomorphic to C. Clearly, all linear embeddings are PL embeddings, and all PL embeddings are topological.

It is still true that every d-complex linearly embeds in $\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$, simply by placing the vertices generically. In fact, any $2d+2$ of the n vertices can

*Supported by an EPDI postdoctoral fellowship and by the Romanian NASR, CNCS — UEFISCDI, project PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0533.

**Supported by the DFG Collaborative Research Center TRR 109, "Discretization in Geometry and Dynamics".

be assumed to be affinely independent; hence any two d-faces spanned by disjoint sets of vertices will be skew to one another.

By taking cones over non-planar graphs, one can easily produce examples of d-complexes that do not embed in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ (neither linearly, nor PL, nor topologically). Whether a specific complex embeds in some $\mathbb{R}^k$ or not is a more delicate matter, and the subject of obstruction theory; see [RS99] for details.

There is a simple way to generate complexes that PL-embed in $\mathbb{R}^3$, but not linearly:

Example 0.1. The *stick number* of a knot is the minimal number of edges needed to realize the knot as a simplicial complex in $\mathbb{R}^3$. All non-trivial knots have stick number ≥ 6. For any integer $M \geq 6$, we can find a 2-bridge knot K_M of stick number $\geq M$, and by Lickorish–Martin [LM72] also a collapsible triangulation C_M of a 3-ball with a 3-edge subcomplex isotopic to K_M. Every such triangulation is PL (i.e. C_M has a subdivision which is also a subdivision of the tetrahedron), hence it PL-embeds in $\mathbb{R}^3$. However, C_M cannot linearly embed in $\mathbb{R}^3$, otherwise such embedding would realize the knot K_M in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with just 3 edges.

As for the contractibility restriction, in dimension $d \geq 2$ its effect is not completely understood:

Problem 0.2. *Do all contractible d-complexes (linearly/PL/topologically) embed in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$?*

Here is what we know so far:
(1) every acyclic d-complex C does topologically embed in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ [Kra88], [Hor71];
(2) if $d \geq 3$, every acyclic d-complex PL-embeds in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ [Web67];
(3) the previous argument does not extend to $d = 2$. The conjecture that every contractible 2-complex PL-embeds in $\mathbb{R}^4$ is wide open and equivalent to the smooth Poincaré Conjecture (in dimension 4);
(4) by a construction of Glaser, "2-complexes of type $(1, 1, 1)$" (see Def. 0.6 below) PL-embed in $\mathbb{R}^4$, cf. Freed [Fre76].

Here we tackle a combinatorial variant of Problem 0.2, motivated by the following question, which was asked by Robert Connelly (personal communication):

Question 0.3 (Connelly)**.** *Does every collapsible d-complex linearly embed in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$?*

Collapsibility is a stronger property than contractibility, with the advantage that it can be decided algorithmically (though the problem is NP-hard in general [Tan14+]). In the present paper, we solve Question 0.3 positively.

Theorem A. *For each positive integer d, every collapsible d-complex embeds linearly in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$.*

The proof requires a careful induction and choice of generic coordinates; we postpone it to the next section. For the moment, note that the embedding dimension is smallest possible:

Proposition 0.4. *For each positive integer d, there are non-evasive (and in particular collapsible) d-complexes that do not topologically embed in $\mathbb{R}^{2d-1}$.*

Proof. The case $d = 1$ is trivial. For $d \geq 2$, let K_{d-1} be a Van Kampen–Flores $(d-1)$-dimensional complex (cf. [Nev07]), that is, a complex that embeds linearly in $\mathbb{R}^{2d-1}$ but does not topologically embed in $\mathbb{R}^{2d-2}$. Let v be a new vertex and let $C_d = \mathrm{sd}(v * K_{d-1})$. Being the barycentric subdivision of a collapsible complex, C_d is non-evasive [Wel99]. It lives in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Were it embeddable also in $\mathbb{R}^{2d-1}$, the link of v in C would be embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^{2d-2}$; but such link is isomorphic to $\mathrm{sd}\, K_{d-1}$, and K_{d-1} does not PL-embed in $\mathbb{R}^{2d-2}$; a contradiction. □

We also partially extend Theorem A to the class of complexes of type $(1, 1, 1)$, studied by Freed and Glaser, and more generally, to all complexes (contractible or not) that collapse onto a closed polygonal arc after the removal of a triangle. (See the next section for the proof.)

Theorem B. *Every 2-complex with (discrete) Morse vector $(1, 1, 1)$ linearly embeds in $\mathbb{R}^4$.*

Consequences for CAT(0) complexes and a Tverberg-type theorem

In a previous paper [AB14+], we proved that every CAT(0) cube d-complex is collapsible. Since barycentric subdivisions preserve collapsibility, Main Theorem A immediately implies the following:

Corollary 0.5. *Every d-dimensional* CAT(0) *cube complex embeds linearly in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ after a single barycentric subdivision.*

The barycentric subdivision is necessary merely to make the complex simplicial; embedding collapsible polytopal complexes is made difficult by additional coplanarity conditions given by the complex, cf. [Grü03, Sec. 11.1, Pr. 7]. An easy consequence is the following Tverberg-type theorem:

Theorem C. *Let X denote a d-dimensional non-positively curved complex. Let r be a positive integer. Any set of $n \geq (r-1)(2d+1)+1$ points in X can be partitioned into r subsets whose convex hulls intersect.*

Proofs of the theorems

The "obvious" approach for proving Theorem A is to try to use induction on the number of collapses. The idea is to start with a vertex of the complex, and use reverse collapses to iteratively build up the desired simplicial complex. However, this approach has a problem: Say a simplicial complex C' admits an anti-collapse to a complex $C = C' \cup \{\sigma, \Sigma\}$. If we know a geometric realization of C' in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, not always we may use it to achieve a geometric realization for C, for the obvious reason that reattaching σ and Σ may result in creating self-intersections. (If we do not require the faces σ, Σ to be convex simplices, but merely PL cells, then attachment becomes possible; so the problem we face is only geometric in nature, and not topological.)

To bypass this difficulty, we apply a more careful induction argument. Let us adopt the following notation: We denote the i-th coordinate of a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ by x_i. By $x_1 \gg x_2$ we mean that x_1 is a much larger real number than x_2. By "highest vertex" we mean with respect to the first coordinate.

Proof of Theorem A. Let C be a collapsible d-complex. Fix a collapsing sequence that reduces C to a vertex. Viewed backwards, this is an anti-collapsing sequence that progressively constructs C from a vertex. We proceed by induction on (the first part of) the anti-collapsing sequence. If v is a vertex that appears anew in an anti-collapsing step, then we choose its coordinates so that, for all vertices w preceding v in the anti-collapsing sequence, we have

$$v_1 - w_1 \gg |v_i - w_i| > 0 \text{ for all } i \neq 1.$$

For all $k \in \{1, \ldots, d-1\}$, the genericity of v ensures that each k-face containing v that appears in the reverse collapsing steps is embedded. As for the d-faces containing v: Since $v_1 - w_1 \gg |v_i - w_i|$ any new facet σ with highest vertex v is asymptotically flat. Let C' be the complex prior to the elementary anti-collapse that attaches σ. Let $C'_{(d-1)}$ be the $(d-1)$-skeleton of C'. Then σ is embedded if and only if the projection of $C'_{(d-1)}$ to $\text{span}(e_2, e_3, \cdots, e_{2d}) \cong \mathbb{R}^{2d-1}$ is embedded. But this is true because any $(d-1)$-dimensional simplicial complex in $\mathbb{R}^{2d-1}$ with generic vertex coordinates is embedded. □

Definition 0.6 (Type-$(1,1,1)$ complexes)**.** A 2-dimensional simplicial complex is "of type $(1,1,1)$" if it can be obtained by attaching a triangulated disk to a polygonal circle α by the formula

$$\alpha^{\varepsilon(1)}\, \alpha^{\varepsilon(2)}\, \cdots \alpha^{\varepsilon(p)}, \quad \text{where } \varepsilon(i) = \pm 1 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{p} \varepsilon(i) = \pm 1.$$

Because of this last condition, all complexes of type $(1,1,1)$ are contractible, cf. [Fre76].

We can define a more general class of complexes as follows. If C is a 2-complex and T is a triangle of C, we denote by $C-T$ the *deletion* of T from C, that is, the simplicial subcomplex of C induced by all facets different than T.

Definition 0.7 (Complexes with Morse vector $(1,1,1)$)**.** A 2-dimensional simplicial complex C "has Morse vector $(1,1,1)$" if for some triangle T of C, the deletion $C-T$ collapses to a closed polygonal arc.

The reader familiar with Forman's discrete Morse theory [For02] may use the following equivalent definition: there exists a discrete Morse function on C with 1 critical triangle, 1 critical edge and 1 critical vertex — and hence discrete Morse vector $(1,1,1)$.

It is easy to see that all type-$(1,1,1)$ complexes have Morse vector $(1,1,1)$. The converse is false, essentially for two reasons:

(a) complexes with Morse vector $(1,1,1)$ need not be contractible, as shown by the projective plane [For02];

(b) even contractible complexes with Morse vector $(1,1,1)$ need not be produced from a disk as in Def. 0.6. For example, one can produce triangulations of Bing's house with two rooms that are not of type $(1,1,1)$.

Proof of Theorem B. We follow the lines of the proof of Theorem A. Let T be the triangle of C chosen such that $C-T$ collapses onto a closed polygonal arc c. Let us choose a total order of the vertices of C such that the last 3 vertices in such order are the 3 vertices of T.

Let us construct the complex $C-T$ by building it up from c along anti-collapses, as in the construction of the proof of Main Theorem A. With this construction, the 3 vertices of the triangle T have maximal 1-st coordinate. Therefore, attaching the triangle T as cell does not create self-intersections. □

Proof of Theorem C. Up to replacing X with its universal cover, we may assume that X is simply connected. By the Hadamard–Cartan theorem, X is CAT(0). By Theorem A, X embeds in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$; in particular X has a regular neighborhood $\mathrm{N}(X)$ that is a contractible $2d$-manifold (and in particular a ball). Given a pair of a CAT(0) complex and a regular neighborhood, there is a well-known procedure to realize X as convex subset of a CAT(0) $2d$-regular neighborhood $\widehat{X}$, see [DJ91].

Let now S be any set of $n \geq (r-1)(2d+1)+1$ points in $2d$-dimensional CAT(0)-manifold. Then by the Tverberg theorem, the set S can be partitioned into r subsets whose convex hulls intersect. Now, since $\widehat{X}$ is nonpositively curved, the projection map $\widehat{X} \longrightarrow X$ is a contraction map [BH99], whence the claim follows. □

References

[AB14+] K. A. Adiprasito and B. Benedetti, *Metric geometry, convexity and collapsibility*, preprint, available at arXiv:1107.5789.

[BH99] M. R. Bridson and A. Haefliger, *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 319, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.

[DJ91] M. W. Davis and T. Januszkiewicz, *Hyperbolization of polyhedra*, J. Differential Geom. **34** (1991), no. 2, 347–388.

[For02] R. Forman, *A user's guide to discrete Morse theory*, Sém. Lothar. Combin. **48** (2002), Art. B48c, 35.

[Fre76] B. M. Freed, *Embedding contractible* 2*-complexes in* $\mathbb{E}^4$, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **54** (1976), 423–430.

[Grü03] B. Grünbaum, *Convex Polytopes*, second ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 221, Springer, New York, 2003.

[Hor71] K. Horvatić, *On embedding polyhedra and manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **157** (1971), 417–436.

[Kra88] M. Kranjc, *Embedding* 2*-complexes in* $\mathbb{R}^4$, Pac. J. Math. **133** (1988), no. 2, 301–313.

[LM72] W. B. R. Lickorish and G. M. Martin, *Triangulations of the* 3*-ball with knotted spanning* 1*-simplexes and collapsible* r*-th derived subdivisions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **170** (1972), 451–458.

[Nev07] E. Nevo, *Higher minors and Van Kampen's obstruction*, Math. Scand. **101** (2007), 161–176.

[RS99] D. Repovš and A. B. Skopenkov, *New results on embeddings of polyhedra and manifolds in Euclidean spaces*, Russ. Math. Surv. **54** (1999), 1149–1196.

[Tan14+] M. Tancer, *Recognition of collapsible complexes is NP-complete*, preprint, available at arxiv:1211.6254.

[Web67] C. Weber, *Plongements de polyhèdres dans le domaine métastable*, Comment. Math. Helv. **42** (1967), 1–27.

[Wel99] V. Welker, *Constructions preserving evasiveness and collapsibility*, Discrete Math. **207** (1999), 243–255.